P vs. NP

Daniel Uribe

January 15, 2016

Contents

1 Problem Statement **2**
- 1.1 Introduction . . . 2
  - 1.1.1 Definition of **P** . . . 3
  - 1.1.2 Definition of **NP** . . . 6
  - 1.1.3 Informal Definition of **NP-complete** . . . 7

2 Lower Bound for Sorting Algorithms **8**
- 2.1 Decision Trees . . . 8
- 2.2 The Symmetric Group . . . 8
- 2.3 Bounding Runtime from Below . . . 9

3 NP-complete **15**
- 3.1 The Clique Problem . . . 15
  - 3.1.1 Representing the Graph as a Matrix . . . 15
  - 3.1.2 Testing for Subnetworks . . . 17
  - 3.1.3 Identifying Cliques of a Certain Size . . . 19
  - 3.1.4 Lower Bound for Flow Control Based Algorithm . . . 21
  - 3.1.5 Constructing a Worst Case . . . 23
  - 3.1.6 Demonstrating $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$ . . . 33

Chapter 1

Problem Statement

1.1 Introduction

Given a set of inputs and an algorithm, how many operations does it take for the algorithm to terminate? This is the question at the heart of algorithm analysis and the essence of the question of $\mathbf{P} \stackrel{?}{=} \mathbf{NP}$.

Computer scientists and software engineers study a variety of problems as well as a handful of solutions. The more nascent the programmer, the more trivial the problem. After "hello world", the first assignment given to undergraduates in the subject is typically a sorting problem.

Given an array of integers as input, write a function which will return the same set of numbers in ascending order. Example input $[10, 5, 27, 1]$.

To an experienced programmer leveraging a high level language, the problem reduces to a call to the language's built-in sort routine. However, to the inexperienced programmer, either unaware of the built in functionality or forbidden from using it, this is a very humbling problem.

My approach, when initially given this problem with a set of 10 numbers, was a method known as bubble sort. The algorithm is simple to conceive and relatively easy to implement:

```
var inputArray = [ 10, 5, 27, 1 ];
var index = 1;
while index < inputArray.Length do
  var a = inputArray[index - 1];
  var b = inputArray[index];
  if b < a then
    inputArray[index - 1] = b;
    inputArray[index] = a;
    index = 1;
  else
    index++;
  end if
end while
```

At first, there is an aura of greatness felt by an individual able to write a program without an infinite loop. However, once this aura fades and the input set gets larger, one must ask, "how long is this supposed to take?"

1.1.1 Definition of P

A language L is in **P** if and only if there exists a deterministic Turing machine M, such that

1. M runs for polynomial time on all inputs;
2. $\forall\, x \in L, M$ outputs 1; and
3. $\forall\, x \notin L, M$ outputs 0.

Understanding P

This language is a bit unwieldy, so let us simplify the terminology a bit.

The deterministic Turing machine M can be thought of as any PC in the world. Here, deterministic implies that under identical conditions, the program will always execute the same set of instructions and output the same

result. This is what we generally assume to be the case when we run a program. For example, a calculator asked to add $2 + 2$ will always output 4, rather than some random number.

The language L represents what we typically think of a program, but with the added restriction that it may answer only "yes" or "no" to whatever question it is asked.

While sorting is not immediately a "yes" or "no" question, it may be morphed into one by asking the language L (i.e. the program), "if I give you this array of integers, is it possible for you to sort it?" Any mathematician would respond by stating that the integers are a totally ordered set, so this question should always be answered in constant time. While true, especially for mathematicians, a computer must evaluate the input before it can state "yes" or "no" (i.e. 1 or 0).

With this understanding of $\mathbf{P}$, we can now establish a worst case runtime for bubble sort. The input requiring maximal position swap operations is an array which is sorted in descending order. For a computer to answer the "is sortable" question, it must:

1. test array elements a_0, a_1 at positions 0 and 1 (resp.);
2. swap array positions 0 and 1, i.e. $a_0 \to$ position 1 and $a_1 \to$ position 0;
3. test array elements a_1, a_0 at positions 0 and 1 (resp.);
4. test array elements a_0, a_2 at positions 1 and 2 (resp.);
5. swap array positions 1 and 2, i.e. $a_0 \to$ position 2 and $a_2 \to$ position 1;
6. test array positions a_1, a_2 at positions 0 and 1 (resp.);
7. swap array positions 0 and 1, i.e. $a_1 \to$ position 1 and $a_2 \to$ position 0;
8. ....

Ultimately, the 0^{th} and 1^{st} elements are swapped $n-1$ times. The 1^{st} and 2^{nd} elements are swapped $n-2$ times and so on, until finally the $(n-2)^{\text{nd}}$ and $(n-1)^{\text{st}}$ elements are swapped just once. This totals $n \cdot (n-1)/2$ operations, as seen by

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i =& 1 + 2 + 3 + \cdots + (n-1) \\ & + (n-1) + (n-2) + \cdots + 1 \\ =& \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} n \\ =& n \cdot (n-1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i = \frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2}.$$

Additionally, for every swap, there is a corresponding comparison of adjacent elements which does not result in a swap. These additional tests double the total number of operations relevant to the algorithm,

$$2 \cdot \frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2} = n^2 - n.$$

Worst case runtime is an analysis of asymptotic behavior, i.e. how the execution time of the program scales as $n \to \infty$. Even though bubble sort is n operations "better than" an algorithm that executes n^2 operations, the execution time of the program still scales on the order of n^2. That is, if it takes 10 seconds to sort an array of 1 million elements ($n = 10^6$), then sorting 2 million elements ($2 \cdot n$) will take ~ 40 seconds to execute.

The notation for this asymptotic behavior is $O(n^2)$ (pronounced "big-Oh" of n^2). Since, both $n^2 - n$ and n^2 are polynomials, bubble sort is said to be in **P**.

Two important questions:

1. is it possible to do better? (yes)
2. is it possible to do worse? (yes)

A **comparison based algorithm**, or **flow control based algorithm**, is an algorithm which makes execution path decisions based on the result of a comparison, for example $b < a$. As we will show, the best possible runtime for a flow control based sorting algorithm is $\Omega(n \cdot \log n)$.

The worst possible runtime is that the program never terminates. The set of problems for which the best algorithms never halt is not a terribly fun branch of computer science to study. So, let us move on to a more interesting complexity class.

1.1.2 Definition of NP

A language L is in **NP** if and only if there exist polynomials p and q, and a deterministic Turing machine M, such that

1. $\forall\, x, y$, the machine M runs in time $p(|x|)$ on input (x, y);
2. $\forall\, x \in L$, $\exists$ a string y of length $q(|x|)$ such that $M(x, y) = 1$;
3. $\forall\, x \notin L$ and all strings y of length $q(|x|)$, $M(x, y) = 0$.

Understanding NP

Again, let us translate from the formal definition to a more intuitive interpretation. **NP** is the class of problems which may be checked in polynomial time on a deterministic Turing machine. The non-deterministic part of **NP** is the input string y, which is an answer provided as an input to the program by some "oracle".

The definition is obfuscated by the fact that we are given two variables as input, (x, y), but the runtime $p(|x|)$ requires just the one variable x. The variable y is required as an input because we are executing a test. In the example of the clique problem, this test will be an equality comparison between two bit-strings.

The second statement of the definition specifies a closure criterion with a space limitation on the test string. Given x as input, do something and return a binary string. We require the existence of some second string y, where length$(y) = q(|x|)$, such that we can test if someFunctionRetVal$(x) == y$.

The final clause of the definition of **NP** states that there are some inputs x for which no solution matching y can be found. In the case of the clique problem, the input x and test string y are $n \times n$ matrices which M maps to bit strings for comparison.

1.1.3 Informal Definition of NP-complete

Informally, we may refer to **NP-complete** as the set of problems which are in **NP** but are possibly not in **P**. Examples of such problems are the Boolean satisfiability problem (SAT), the traveling salesman problem, and the clique problem.

For a problem to be in **NP** but not in **P**, it must be able to validate a solution in polynomial time, yet require exponential time or worse to find a solution. That is, the number of instructions necessary to compute a correct solution, scales on the order of 2^n.

Chapter 2

Lower Bound for Sorting Algorithms

2.1 Decision Trees

In computer science, a **decision tree** is a binary tree in which every interior node represents a binary comparison and the edges represent a decision that was made in program flow control. For example:

```
// a < b is a binary comparison
if a < b then
   // statement true, traverse left child branch
else
   // statement false, traverse right child branch
end if
```

Let us limit our discussion to only programs with a finite number of execution steps, such as the problem of sorting a set of finite size. Then each leaf node of the decision tree represents a possible final state.

2.2 The Symmetric Group

A sorting algorithm takes an input array, A, and maps it to an output array B consisting of the same set of numbers but possibly rearranged. In other words, it permutes the elements of A.

In mathematics, the **symmetric group** is the group of permutations which act on a set of elements. This group plays a very important role in abstract algebra. It is typically denoted by either S_Ω or S_n, where Ω is a set and n is the number of elements in the set.

Note that $|S_n| = n!$.

2.3 Bounding Runtime from Below

Assume we are sorting a set of integers. Formally, we may think of the program acting as a bijective function $\sigma \in S_\Omega$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sigma : \Omega \to \Omega$.

Since we require our algorithm to find an answer if it exists, we can restrict the set of possible final states for the sorting algorithm, i.e. the permutations of Ω. Each final state is represented by the leaf node of a binary decision tree.

Observe that since $|S_\Omega| = n!$, where $n = |\Omega|$, we can state that there are at least $n!$ leaf nodes in the decision tree of any sorting algorithm.

Let's assume that there exists some optimal sorting algorithm. In terms of a decision tree, this algorithm would be represented by a tree with no more than $n!$ leaf nodes and have a minimal tree height.

A full binary tree of height $h \in \mathbb{N}$ has 2^h leaf nodes. Note that

$$h = \log_2 2^h.$$

We note that the decision tree with $n!$ leaf nodes will never be a full binary tree when $n > 2$. Recall that the height for any given leaf node represents the number comparisons between two elements $a, b \in \Omega$ in order to sort the set. In other words, h represents the algorithm's runtime.

Claim

Any flow control based sorting algorithm on a set of n elements has an asymptotic lower bound of $\Omega(n \log_2 n)$.

Proof

To minimize the number of instructions executed in the worst case, we must minimize the decision tree's height.

Consider $h \in \mathbb{N}$ to be the height of the decision tree. Recall that this optimal comparison based sorting algorithm may be thought of as $\sigma \in S_\Omega$ acting on a set Ω of size n.

In order to satisfy the requirement that a solution be found when it exists, there must be one leaf node in the decision tree for every $\sigma \in S_\Omega$. Since $|S_\Omega| = n!$, we require $n!$ leaf nodes.

A full binary tree of height h contains 2^h leaf nodes. Since $n! \nmid 2^h$ for $n > 2$, the decision tree with $n!$ leaves will not be a full binary tree when $n > 2$. Thus,

$$2^h \geq n!,$$

with equality only when $n = 2$.

Since h represents the algorithm's worst case runtime, an optimal algorithm requires h be as small as possible while still satisfying $2^h \geq n!$. Hence,

$$n! > 2^{h-1},$$

since if that relation does not hold, then $2^{h-1} \geq n!$ and h is not the smallest integer satisfying $2^h \geq n$. A contradiction.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} h_n &\geq n!, \\ h_{n+1} &> (n+1)!, \text{ and} \\ h_{n+2} &> (n+2)!. \end{aligned}$$

For $n \geq 2, (n+1) > 2$. Thus, we may recognize the following sequence of bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} n! &\leq h_n \\ &< 2 \cdot n! \\ &< (n+1)! \\ &< h_{n+1} \\ &< 2 \cdot (n+1)! \\ &< (n+2)! \\ &< h_{n+2}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular

$$h_n < h_{n+1} < h_{n+2}.$$

This bounds the asymptotic behavior of odd sized networks between that of the adjacent even sized networks. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that n is even when discussing runtime.

For $n > 2$, we have

$$\log_2 2^h > \log_2 n! \iff h > \log_2 n!.$$

Simplifying the right hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h &> \log_2 n! \\ &= \log_2 \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} i \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\log_2 i \right), \end{aligned}$$

since $\log a \cdot b = \log a + \log b$. Continuing to simplify, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h &> \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\log_2 i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} (\log_2 i) + \sum_{j=n/2+1}^{n} (\log_2 j) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $n > 2$ is even. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} (\log_2 i) &= \log_2 1 + \underbrace{\log_2 2 + \cdots + \log_2 n/2}_{\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right) \text{ terms}} \\ &> \log_2 1 + \underbrace{\log_2 2 + \cdots + \log_2 2}_{\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right) \text{ terms}} \\ &= 0 + \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) \cdot 1 \\ &= \frac{n}{2} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=n/2+1}^{n} (\log_2 j) &= \underbrace{\log_2 \left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right) + \log_2 \left(\frac{n}{2}+2\right) + \cdots + \log_2 (n)}_{\frac{n}{2} \text{ terms}} \\ &> \underbrace{\log_2 \left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \log_2 \left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \cdots + \log_2 \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}_{\frac{n}{2} \text{ terms}} \\ &= \left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \cdot \log_2 \left(\frac{n}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Resuming the previous simplification, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h &> \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} (\log_2 i) + \sum_{j=n/2+1}^{n} (\log_2 j) \\ &> \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) + \left(\frac{n}{2} \cdot \log_2 \frac{n}{2}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) + \frac{n}{2} (\log_2 n - \log_2 2) \\ &= \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) + \frac{n}{2} (\log_2 n - 1) \\ &= \frac{n \log_2 n}{2} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

This lower bound for h represents the best we could hope to achieve for a flow control based sorting algorithm. Thus, any algorithm with asymptotic runtime $O(n \log_2 n)$ can be considered optimal. ■

It is occasionally mentioned that algorithms such as radix sort, which are not comparison based, are able to sort in linear time. The asymptotic runtime of radix sort is given by $O(wn)$, where n is the number of elements and w is the maximum string length for a number in the set.

While radix sort is indeed a clever algorithm, it is still unable to escape this lower bound in the worst case.

Claim

Even non-comparison based sorting algorithms, such as radix sort, are still at best $O(n \log_2 n)$.

Proof

Since asymptotic growth is independent of the choice of base counting system, i.e. binary is just as good as decimal, let's choose binary.

Consider a simple worst case scenario, a permutation of the set $[0, 255]$. In this example, $n = 256, w = 8$ (one byte) $= \log_2(n)$. And we see that

$$O(wn) = O(n \log_2 n).\blacksquare$$

Chapter 3

NP-complete

3.1 The Clique Problem

The **clique problem** refers to the general problem of identifying a complete subgraph of a given graph. Its name is derived from the particular case where the nodes of a graph represent the people within a given social network, e.g. students in a school, and the edges represent a mutual social connection between the nodes, e.g. friendship between pairs of students.

In this example, a clique would represent a group of students, where every student considers every other member of the group to be their friend.

3.1.1 Representing the Graph as a Matrix

For a given network of size n, construct an $n \times n$ matrix. Let a, b be two nodes in the network. We say that $a \sim b$ if the social connection is satisfied and $a \nsim b$ otherwise.

Assume that the social connection between two nodes satisfies a reflexive property. That is, $a \sim a$.

The problem states that the social connection must be mutual, which indicates the presence of symmetry. That is, $a \sim b \iff b \sim a$.

For each element of the matrix, assign the value 1 if $a \sim b$ and 0 when $a \nsim b$. By the reflexive property, we have that every element of the main diagonal

is assigned the value 1. Also, by the symmetric property, we have that the matrix is symmetric.

Example

Consider the following network with 6 nodes and a maximal clique size of 3.



We may represent this network with the following symmetric matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

3.1.2 Testing for Subnetworks

The bitwise AND operation, denoted '&', is a binary operator. The operator accepts two binary strings a, b of length k, and outputs a third binary string, also of length k.

The output string has a 1 in its i^{th} bit if the i^{th} bit of both a and b is 1. Otherwise, the i^{th} bit is 0. A logic gate may be constructed to perform this bitwise operation in constant time for binary strings equal to the length of a word for the gate. In a 64-bit machine, the word length would be 64-bits.

Therefore, we may refer to any bitwise AND operation performed on two binary strings with at most 64 bits as a constant time operation on a 64-bit computer. However, as $k \to \infty$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} f(k) &= \left\lceil \frac{k}{64} \right\rceil \\ &= O(k), \end{aligned}$$

where $f(k)$ defines the number of operations necessary to satisfy a bitwise AND function call on two strings of length k.

Returning to the clique problem, we note that a social network matrix M, constists of n^2 binary digits. We may flatten this $n \times n$ matrix into a single bit string with length $k = n^2$, by concatenating the matrix rows together.

For example, the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

would map to the binary string

"100011011111011100011100110010110001".

We may define a second $n \times n$ matrix N. If N satisfies the reflexive and symmetric properties required of the social network matrix M, then N may also be regarded as defining a social network.

Claim

Let A, B be the $n \times n$ matrices representing two networks of size n. Then A and B may be compared for a common subnetwork using the bitwise AND operator.

Proof

By definition, the bitwise AND operator takes as input two binary strings of length k. We have already shown that an $n \times n$ matrix may be flattened, via row concatenation, into a binary string of length $k = n^2$.

Also, by definition, the bitwise AND operator will output a binary string of length k. A third matrix, C, may be recovered by splitting the k-length binary string into n separate n-length row vectors. These row vectors may then be used to construct C as an $n \times n$ matrix.

Let $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i, j \in [1, n]$. Observe that for each pair (i, j) the bitwise AND compares the element $a = A_{ij}$ with $b = B_{ij}$, outputting

$$c = a\&b,$$

where $c = C_{ij}$.

Since $A_{ii} = B_{ii} = 1$, by the reflexive property of the social network, we have that $C_{ii} = 1$ for $i \in [1, n]$. Thus, C satisfies the reflexive property of a social network's matrix representation.

Since both A and B are symmetric, we have that $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ and $B_{ij} = B_{ji}$. It follows that C satisfies the symmetric requirement, since

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ij} &= A_{ij}\&B_{ij} \\ &= A_{ji}\&B_{ji} \\ &= C_{ji}. \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

3.1.3 Identifying Cliques of a Certain Size

Let N represent a social network of size n. Consider a clique Q of size q within the network N, where $q \leq n$.

The matrix representation of Q must satisfy the reflexive and symmetric properties of a social network matrix. In addition, cliques possess a transitive property such that if $a \sim b$ and $b \sim c$, then $a \sim c$ for all $a, b, c \in Q$.

Thus, the matrix for Q will consist of q rows which represent nodes in the clique, and $(n - q)$ rows which represent nodes excluded from the clique. Excluded nodes will have a 0 at every entry off the main diagonal. Rows representing included nodes will be identical due to the reflexive, symmetric, and transitive properties of a clique.

Example

Consider the network

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We may define a clique

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that only rows for nodes in the clique Q have non-zero entries off the main diagonal.

Definition

Define a **subnetwork comparison** as a test for the presence of a subnetwork M in a network N, denoted $M \subset N$.

Claim

Let N be an $n \times n$ matrix representing a social network with n nodes. Let Q be a possible clique within the social network given by N.

Then a subnetwork comparison of Q within N may be performed using the bitwise AND operator and an equality comparison with runtime $O(n^2)$.

Proof

We have already demonstrated that two networks may be compared using the bitwise AND operator by first flattening their matrix representations into a k-length bit string, where $k = n^2$.

Also, by previous results, we have that the number of operations necessary to perform a bitwise AND computation on two k-length bit strings is $O(k)$. Since $k = n^2$, we have that $O(k) = O(n^2)$. Equality may also be tested in $O(n^2)$ by a comparison of the bit string representations.

Let C be the social network matrix computed by the bitwise AND on N and Q. If $Q_{ij} = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ij} &= N_{ij} \,\&\, Q_{ij} \\ &= N_{ij} \,\&\, 0 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is, $Q_{ij} = C_{ij}$ for all (i, j) pairs such that $Q_{ij} = 0$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ij} \neq C_{ij} &\iff Q_{ij} = 1, C_{ij} = 0 \\ &\iff Q_{ij} = 1, N_{ij} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, we need only test if $C = Q$ to determine if the clique is present in the network N. Since both the bitwise AND operation and the $C = Q$ equality comparison are $O(n^2)$ operations, the claim is proven. ■

Claim

The clique problem is in **NP**.

Proof

This follows immediately from the previous result. Given a clique Q, we may verify its presence in a social network N in polynomial time, in particular $O(n^2)$. ■

3.1.4 Lower Bound for Flow Control Based Algorithm

For the sorting problem, we proved the existence of a lower bound $\Omega(n \log_2 n)$ using a decision tree where leaf nodes are the possible outcomes and interior nodes represent a comparison,

$$a < b.$$

Since our computational model is that of a deterministic Turing machine, we require that the solution set is a subset of the possible final states of the program. Hence, for a sorting algorithm there must be one leaf node for every permutation $\sigma \in S_n$. From this we concluded that sorting algorithms are $\Omega(\log_2 n!) = \Omega(n \log_2 n)$.

For the clique problem, we consider a decision tree where the comparison is a **subnetwork comparison** $M \subset N$, rather than $a < b$.

Theorem

The minimum number of subnetwork comparisons for any deterministic algorithm to identify the presence of a clique of size q in a network of size n is equal to the number of combinations for q in n. That is,

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ q \end{array} \right).$$

Proof

The solution set is a subset of the possible final states of the program. Since there are n nodes in the network, each clique of size q selects q nodes from the network without replacement. In statistics, n choose q is given by

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ q \end{array} \right) = \frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!}.$$

Each clique represents a subnetwork which may or may not be present in the root network. Since each clique has a possible state of 1 (present) or 0 (not present), we see that our solution set must contain at least

$$2^{\frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!}}$$

possible outcomes.

Thus, the minimum height for a decision tree which can span this solution set is

$$\begin{aligned} \log_2 2^{\frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!}} &= \frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} \\ &= \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ q \end{array} \right). \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Given that we must perform a minimum of

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ q \end{array} \right) = \frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!}.$$

comparisons, and there are exactly $\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ q \end{array} \right)$ subnetworks of size q, we can state that a linear search through subcliques of size q is an optimal algorithm.

3.1.5 Constructing a Worst Case

For a given n, $\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ q \end{array} \right)$ is maximal when $q = \frac{n}{2}$. To see this, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} &= \frac{n!}{(n-q)!(n-(n-q))!} \\ &= \frac{n!}{(n-q)!q!} \end{aligned}$$

implies

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ q \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ (n-q) \end{array} \right).$$

Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that $q \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Consider the expression

$$\frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} = \frac{n \cdot (n-1) \cdots 2 \cdot 1}{q! \cdot (n-q)!}.$$

as q increases from 1 to $\frac{n}{2}$.

1. When $q = 1$, the expression takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} &= \frac{n!}{1 \cdot (n-1)!} \\ &= n. \end{aligned}$$

   Set $a_1 = n$.

2. When $q = 2$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} &= \frac{n!}{2 \cdot (n-2)!} \\ &= \frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Set $a_2 = \frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2}$. Note that

$$a_2 = a_1 \cdot \frac{n-1}{2}$$

3. When $2 \leq q \leq \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right)$, we see that

$$a_{q+1} = \frac{n-q}{q+1}.$$

This recurrence defines a monotonically increasing sequence, since

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(n-q)}{q+1} &\geq \frac{(n-q)}{\frac{n}{2}} \\ &= 2 \cdot \frac{n-q}{n} \\ &= 2 - 2 \cdot \frac{q}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

From our choice of q we have

$$q \leq \frac{n}{2} - 1.$$

Dividing both sides by n gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{q}{n} &\leq \frac{n}{2n} - \frac{1}{n} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$-\frac{q}{n} \geq -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(n-q)}{q+1} &\geq 2 + 2 \cdot \left(-\frac{q}{n}\right) \\ &\geq 2 + 2 \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}\right) \\ &\geq 1 + \frac{2}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that the maximal number of combinations for subnetworks of size q occurs at $q = \frac{n}{2}$ when n is even, and $q = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$ when n is odd. Without loss of generality, we may assume that n is even.

We may now rewrite the number of combinations for the clique problem in the worst case by substituting $q = \frac{n}{2}$, i.e.

$$\frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} = \frac{n \cdot (n-1) \cdots 2 \cdot 1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)! \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)!}.$$

Relating the Worst Case Scenario to 2^n

Define $\Gamma(n) = (n-1)!$, where $\Gamma(n)$ is Euler's gamma function. The duplication formula for the gamma function is given by

$$\Gamma(z) \cdot \Gamma(z + 1/2) = 2^{1-2z}\sqrt{\pi} \cdot \Gamma(2z).$$

Let $z = \frac{n}{2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2^n}{2 \cdot \sqrt{\pi}} &= \frac{\Gamma(n)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right)} \\ &= \frac{(n-1)!}{\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right)! \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right)} \\ &= \frac{(n-1)!}{\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right)! \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right)}\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}f(n) &= \frac{2^n}{2 \cdot \sqrt{\pi}} \\ &= \frac{(n-1)!}{\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right)! \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right)}.\end{aligned}$$

Separate the latter representation into factors $\alpha(n), \beta(n), \gamma(n)$. The numerator is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(n) &= \Gamma(n) \\ &= (n-1)! \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} i,\end{aligned}$$

and the denominator is given by the factors

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(n) &= \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right)! \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} j,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(n) &= \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{n-3}{2}\right)\cdots\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\cdot\underbrace{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}_{=\sqrt{\pi}} \\ &= \sqrt{\pi}\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Define $h(n)$ as the worst case combination function. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}h(n) &= \frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} \\ &= \frac{n\cdot(n-1)\cdots 2\cdot 1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)!\cdot\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)!}.\end{aligned}$$

Analysis of $f(n)$

Observe

$$\begin{aligned}f(n) &= \frac{2^n}{2\cdot\sqrt{\pi}} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(n)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\cdot\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \\ &= \frac{(n-1)!}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)!\cdot\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} i}{\left(\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} j\right)\cdot\sqrt{\pi}\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)}.\end{aligned}$$

Define $\tilde{f}(n) = 2\sqrt{\pi} \cdot f(n)$, that is

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}(n) &= 2^n \\
&= 2 \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} i}{\left(\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} j\right) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k - \frac{1}{2}\right)} \\
&= 2 \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=\frac{n}{2}}^{n-1} i}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k - \frac{1}{2}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Analysis of $h(n)$

Recall

$$\begin{aligned}
h(n) &= \frac{n!}{q!(n-q)!} \\
&= \frac{n \cdot (n-1) \cdots 2 \cdot 1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)! \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)!} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} i}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j^2} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{i=\frac{n}{2}+1}^{n} i}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we can show that $h(n)$ is bounded below by a function of exponential order, i.e. a function not in $\mathbb{P}$, then we will have demonstrated that $h(n) \notin \mathbb{P}$. With that goal in mind, define

$$h(n) > \tilde{f}(n) \cdot g(n).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\prod_{i=\frac{n}{2}+1}^{n} i}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} &> 2 \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=\frac{n}{2}}^{n-1} i}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot g(n) \\
\frac{n}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} &> 2 \cdot \frac{\frac{n}{2}}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot g(n) \\
\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} &> \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot g(n).
\end{aligned}$$

Expanding both sides of the inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} &> \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot g(n) \\
\frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)\cdots(2)\cdot(1)} &> \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)-\frac{1}{2}\right)\cdots\left(2-\frac{1}{2}\right)\cdot\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot g(n).
\end{aligned}$$

Setting aside $g(n)$, let us consider the relationship between the two fractions

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)\cdots(2)\cdot(1)} &\sim \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)-\frac{1}{2}\right)\cdots\left(2-\frac{1}{2}\right)\cdot\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \\
\underbrace{\frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)}\cdots\frac{1}{(2)}\cdot\frac{1}{(1)}}_{\frac{n}{2}\text{ terms}} &\sim \underbrace{\frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\right)}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)-\frac{1}{2}\right)}\cdots\frac{1}{\left(2-\frac{1}{2}\right)}\cdot\frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right)}}_{\frac{n}{2}\text{ terms}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\frac{n}{2}} &< \frac{1}{\frac{n}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \\
\frac{1}{\frac{n}{2}-1} &< \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\vdots \\
\frac{1}{2} &< \frac{1}{2-\frac{1}{2}} \\
\frac{1}{1} &< \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)} \cdots \frac{1}{(2)} \cdot \frac{1}{(1)} \sim \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\left(\frac{n}{2}-1\right)-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdots \frac{1}{\left(2-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right)}$$

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} < \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)}.$$

Note that this result implies $g(n) \neq 1$, since

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} \not> \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot 1.$$

Let

$$g(n) = \left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} \sim \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot g(n)$$

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} \sim \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \cdot \left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)-\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} \sim \frac{1}{\prod_{k=2}^{\frac{n}{2}+1} \left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)}.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{\frac{n}{2}} > \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)-\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\frac{1}{\frac{n}{2}-1} > \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)-\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\frac{1}{2} > \frac{1}{3-\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\frac{1}{1} > \frac{1}{2-\frac{1}{2}},$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} &> \frac{1}{\prod_{k=2}^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \\
\frac{n}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} &> \frac{2\cdot\frac{n}{2}}{\prod_{k=2}^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \\
\frac{\prod_{i=\frac{n}{2}+1}^{n} i}{\prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j} &> 2\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=\frac{n}{2}}^{n-1} i}{\prod_{k=2}^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\left(k-\frac{1}{2}\right)} \\
h(n) &> \tilde{f}(n)\cdot g(n).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that since $\tilde{f}(n) = 2^n$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}(n)\cdot g(n) &= 2^n\cdot\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right)\cdot\frac{1}{\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{2^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)-\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{2^{n-1}}{\left(\frac{n}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \\
&= \frac{2^{n-1}}{\frac{1}{2}(n+1)} \\
&= \frac{2^n}{(n+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(n) &= \tilde{f}(n)\cdot g(n) \\
&= \frac{2^n}{(n+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$h(n) > \tilde{f}(n)\cdot g(n)$$

we see that

$$h(n) > \phi(n).$$

3.1.6 Demonstrating P $\neq$ NP

Claim

The function

$$\phi(n) = \tilde{f}(n) \cdot g(n)$$

is of the order

$$\phi(n) = O\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right).$$

Proof

Recall

$$\phi(n) = \frac{2^n}{(n+1)}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\phi(n)}{\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\frac{2^n}{(n+1)}}{\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)} \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2^n}{(n+1)} \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2^n}\right) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{(n+1)} \\
&= 1.\blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

Claim

A problem with an optimal algorithm $O\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$ is not in **P**.

Proof

Observe that for any polynomial $p(n) \in \mathbb{P}$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{p(n)}{\frac{2^n}{n}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n \cdot p(n)}{2^n}.$$

Since the product of any two polynomials in $\mathbb{P}$ is again in $\mathbb{P}$, we have that $q(n) = n \cdot p(n)$ and $q(n) \in \mathbb{P}$.

Thus, our limit is now

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{q(n)}{2^n} = 0.$$

To see that the exponential function outgrows any polynomial, expand the polynomial, separate the terms into separate fractions, and repeatedly apply L'Hopital's rule until all numerators have vanished.

If $\frac{2^n}{n} \in \mathbb{P}$, then there exists a scalar multiple $q(n) \in \mathbb{P}$ such that

$$q(n) = c \cdot \frac{2^n}{n}$$

and hence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{q(n)}{\frac{2^n}{n}} = c.$$

We have already demonstrated that no such $q(n)$ exists in $\mathbb{P}$.

Since $\frac{2^n}{n} \notin \mathbb{P}$, any problem with optimal algorithmic runtime $O\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$ is not in **P**. ■

Before we can prove the main result, we must demonstrate that the problem of identifying the first clique Q of size q in network N of size n is also $\Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$.

Claim

Let there be a single clique Q of size $q = \frac{n}{2}$ in network N of size $n >= 4$.

Then the decision tree of any optimal algorithm must have more than one leaf node identifying $Q \subset N$.

Proof

In the case of a network, decisions may be based on one of two questions:

1. Does node a relate to node b?
2. Is subnetwork A present in N?

We've already demonstrated that any algorithm which asks the second question is $\Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$.

On the other hand, imagine a decision tree which asks a perfect set of questions. Half the answers are to the left of root, the other half to the right, and no answer appears more than once. However, we're only allowed to ask one question "does $a \sim b$?"

Since we're making decisions, we can imagine these interior nodes as:

```
if a ∼ b then
  // statement true, traverse left child branch
else
  // statement false, traverse right child branch
end if
```

The program's first choice of a and b will be based on a position in memory, rather than any state of input N. Choose Q such that both $a, b \notin Q$. Since Q is the only correct clique, it must be identified as such by both the left and right subtrees. Hence, there must be more than one leaf node which identifies $Q \subset N$. ■

Claim

Let N be a network of size n, Q a clique of size $q = \frac{n}{2}$. Then the equivalence class of networks N for which Q is a subnetwork has

$$2^{\frac{3n^2}{8} - \frac{n}{4}}$$

members.

Proof

Consider the matrix representation. It's symmetric and the permutation of nodes is arbitrary. So, choose the arrangement such that the clique of size $\frac{n}{2}$ has the $\frac{n}{2}$ largest numbers. In the matrix, this will be 1's along the main diagonal and the southeast quadrant, and 0's elsewhere.

In particular, in the upper triangle, there are $(n-1)$ zeros in row 1, $(n-2)$ zeros in row 2, ..., $(n/2-1)$ zeros in row $\frac{n}{2}$. This is equal to the number of elements in the upper triangle minus the bottom $\frac{n}{2}$ rows. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i \\ &= \frac{n^2 - n}{2} \\ y &= \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} j \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2} + 1\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \frac{n^2}{8} + \frac{n}{4} \end{aligned}$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned} x - y &= \frac{n^2 - n}{2} - \left(\frac{n^2}{8} + \frac{n}{4}\right) \\ &= \frac{3n^2}{8} - \frac{n}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Any of these $\left[\frac{3n^2}{8} - \frac{n}{4}\right]$ matrix elements may exist in one of two states, either 1 or 0, generating

$$2^{\frac{3n^2}{8} - \frac{n}{4}}$$

distinct networks N for which Q is a subnetwork. While only a subset of these will have Q as its only clique of size q, the argument demonstrates that each correct solution must be present "as many times as it takes" to guarantee a correct solution.

Claim

Any optimal algorithm which returns the first instance of a clique of size q is

$$\Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right).$$

Proof

Without loss of generality, assume that $n \geq 16$ is a power of 2.

Consider the matrix representation of a clique of size $q = \frac{n}{2}$ such that the clique is represented by nodes $\frac{n}{2} + 1$ through n. For example,

$$\begin{pmatrix}
1 & * & \cdots & * & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
* & 1 & & \vdots & 0 & \ddots & & \vdots \\
\vdots & & \ddots & * & \vdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
* & \cdots & * & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\
\vdots & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\
\vdots & & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix}.$$

In this example, the top left quadrant of the matrix, i.e. rows 1 through $\frac{n}{2}$ and columns 1 through $\frac{n}{2}$, may be considered as a second subnetwork completely disjoint from Q. Call this subnetwork M, with size $m = \frac{n}{2}$.

The number of cliques in subnetwork M of size $p = \frac{m}{2}$ is given by

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} m \\ p \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \frac{n}{2} \\ \frac{n}{4} \end{array} \right).$$

Since each of these $\left(\begin{array}{c} m \\ p \end{array} \right)$ cliques may either be present or not present, any optimal algorithm must be able to identify $Q \subset N$ as the only clique in N from no fewer than

$$2^{\frac{m!}{\frac{m}{2}!\frac{m}{2}!}}$$

matrices. In particular, this represents the number of leaf nodes which must be present in any decision tree which guarantees to find Q if it is present.

The height of such a tree is

$$\log_2 2^{\frac{m!}{\frac{m}{2}!\frac{m}{2}!}} = \frac{m!}{\frac{m}{2}!.\frac{m}{2}!}.$$

We've already shown this function to be bounded below by $\Omega\left(\frac{2^m}{m}\right)$. Observing that $m = \frac{n}{2}$ is just a scalar multiple of n, we see that

$$\Omega\left(\frac{2^m}{m}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right).$$

Thus, searching for the first clique of size q in a network of size n is $\Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$. ■

Claim

The clique problem is not in **P**.

Proof

This was proven by the previous theorem. The clique problem, regardless of whether the search is for all cliques or just a single clique, has a lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$. ■

Since the clique problem is in **NP-complete**, we have shown that $\mathbf{NP} \neq \mathbf{P}$.

Bibliography

[1] David Epstein, "ICS 161: Design and Analysis of Algorithms" *Sorting*, 16 January 1996. Web. 30 December 2015. https://www.ics.uci.edu/ eppstein/161/960116.html

[2] Erik Demaine, "Introduction to Algorithms" *Counting Sort, Radix Sort, Lower Bounds for Sorting*, 14 January 2013. Web. 30 December 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nz1KZXbghj8

[3] David S. Dummit, Richard M. Foote, *Abstract Algebra*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 3rd edition, 2004.